

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



*Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a*

VOL. LXXIX No. 7

August 15, 2017

366 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

In re Elijah C., 326 C 480	2
<i>Termination of parental rights; dismissal of appeal by Appellate Court as moot; certification from Appellate Court; whether respondent's challenge in Appellate Court to trial court's finding that respondent was unable to benefit from reunification services offered by Department of Children and Families was inadequately briefed; whether Appellate Court improperly dismissed respondent's appeal as moot; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that respondent was unable to benefit from department's reunification efforts; role that Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.) plays in child welfare proceedings, discussed.</i>	
State v. Skipwith, 326 C 512	34
<i>Writ of error; certification from Appellate Court; claim that trial court improperly dismissed plaintiff in error's motion to correct illegal sentence based on violation of her rights under victim's rights amendment in state constitution; claim that this court lacked jurisdiction over writ of error because no express constitutional or statutory provision granted jurisdiction over writ of error seeking to enforce victim's rights amendment; claim that this court was deprived of jurisdiction under clauses in victim's rights amendment providing that legislature shall provide by law for enforcement of amendment and it shall not be construed as creating basis for vacating conviction or ground for appellate relief.</i>	
Volume 326 Cumulative Table of Cases	63

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Arroyo v. University of Connecticut Health Center, 175 CA 493	113A
<i>Medical malpractice; claim that because trial court rendered judgment for plaintiffs on theory of liability materially different from that alleged in notice of claim filed with Claims Commissioner, and for which plaintiffs received waiver of sovereign immunity from commissioner, court was barred under doctrine of sovereign immunity from rendering judgment for plaintiffs on that theory of liability; whether, pursuant to statute (§ 4-160 [b]), commissioner was required to grant plaintiffs permission to bring action against state defendants where plaintiffs properly filed timely notice with commissioner seeking permission to pursue medical malpractice action against defendants and attached good faith certificate to notice; whether, pursuant to statute (§ 4-147 [2]), claim in notice need not be particularized and must contain only concise statement of basis of claim; reviewability of unpreserved claim that court improperly awarded damages to plaintiffs on theory of liability pursued at trial but not alleged in complaint; claim that plaintiffs presented insufficient evidence as to causation; credibility of witnesses; whether court properly determined that plaintiffs satisfied burden of proving causation.</i>	
Cohen v. Meyers, 175 CA 519	139A
<i>Contracts; claim that trial court improperly failed to pierce corporate veil of corporate defendant and to hold individual defendant personally liable for fraud and violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.) by corporate defendant; claim that court's determination that corporate defendant failed to comply with New Home Construction Contractors Act (§ 20-417a et seq.), which formed basis for finding of violation of CUTPA, supported finding that</i>	

(continued on next page)

plaintiff satisfied instrumentality test for piercing corporate veil; whether record supported court's finding that plaintiff offered insufficient evidence to satisfy instrumentality test by failing to show that individual defendant exercised control over corporate defendant to commit fraud or some other wrong; whether court properly ruled in favor of individual defendant on defamation claim; whether challenged statements were defamatory per se; whether plaintiff met burden of proof as to special defense that subject statements were true; whether court properly rejected claims that statements were privileged; claim that court improperly awarded plaintiff damages on CUTPA claim because plaintiff failed to prove that he suffered any compensable injury; credibility of witnesses; claim that court improperly failed to award punitive damages on defamation claim; whether court improperly rejected claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress; whether court properly found that conduct did not rise to level of extreme and outrageous conduct.

- Costa v. Board of Education*, 175 CA 402 22A
Negligence; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment on ground of governmental immunity; whether allegations of acts and omissions by defendants that resulted in personal injuries to student at school sponsored picnic constituted discretionary acts for which defendants were entitled to governmental immunity pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n [a] [2] [B]); claim that genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether certain general safety guidelines and school board policies created ministerial duty on part of defendants; claim that identifiable person-imminent harm exception to governmental immunity applied; whether plaintiffs demonstrated that student was identifiable person.
- DiNapoli v. Regenstein*, 175 CA 383. 3A
Dental malpractice; whether trial court abused discretion in striking certain portions of testimony of expert witness; claim that trial court improperly precluded testimony regarding facts that formed basis of opinions of expert witnesses; whether excluded testimony was inadmissible hearsay; whether precluded questioning concerned matters outside scope of direct examination; whether trial court improperly failed to permit expert witness to answer hypothetical question.
- Ellen S. v. Katlyn F.*, 175 CA 559 179A
Application for civil protection order; whether trial court improperly granted application for civil protection order; claim that trial court improperly determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe that defendant had stalked plaintiff and would continue to do so in absence of order of protection; failure of defendant to obtain memorandum of decision from trial court and to include decision in appendix to brief; whether transcript of trial court proceedings revealed sufficiently detailed and concise statement of court's findings.
- State v. Bozelko*, 175 CA 599. 219A
Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court abused discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that because presentence investigation report utilized by sentencing court contained material and harmful misrepresentations about defendant, defendant's sentence was based on inaccurate and mis-

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 MICHAEL A. GENTILE, *Acting Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

- leading information in violation of defendant's due process rights; whether defendant failed to establish either that such misrepresentation in report was material to sentencing or that sentencing court actually relied on misrepresentation; failure to file motion for articulation; whether defendant was precluded from presenting mitigating evidence to court.*
- State v. McGee, 175 CA 566 186A
- Robbery second degree; conspiracy to commit robbery second degree; sexual assault fourth degree; breach of peace second degree; whether trial court improperly dismissed motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that defendant's constitutional right against double jeopardy was violated as result of imposition of separate sentences for conviction of two counts of second degree robbery that stemmed from single incident but were prosecuted under different subdivisions of statute ([Rev. to 2007] § 53a-135 [a] [1] and [2]) governing second degree robbery; whether conviction of two counts of second degree robbery arose out of same act or transaction; whether each robbery offense required proof of fact that other did not; whether § 53a-135 contained language indicating legislature's intent to bar multiple punishments for perpetrators of second degree robbery who, in committing such offenses, violate multiple subdivisions of statute; whether claim that two sentences were improperly imposed for one incident of second degree robbery was procedurally proper double jeopardy claim over which court had jurisdiction on motion to correct; whether court should have denied, rather than dismissed, motion to correct illegal sentence.*
- State v. Raynor, 175 CA 409 29A
- Assault first degree as accessory; conspiracy to commit assault first degree; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of assault first degree as accessory; whether evidence was sufficient for jury to have found beyond reasonable doubt that defendant aided principal shooter to cause victim physical injury by discharge of firearm and that defendant intended that principal commit assault first degree; whether conviction of conspiracy to commit assault first degree was supported by sufficient evidence; whether jury reasonably could have found that defendant entered into agreement to commit assault first degree and that defendant intended that member of conspiracy would cause physical injury to victim by means of discharge of firearm; reviewability of claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting uncharged misconduct drug evidence on ground of relevance where defendant did not object on that ground at trial; reviewability of claim that uncharged misconduct evidence concerning other shooting should not have been admitted because it was not relevant to defendant's motive or intent to commit charged offenses; whether court abused discretion in determining that probative value of other misconduct evidence outweighed prejudicial effect; reviewability of claim that defendant's constitutional rights were violated when state used peremptory challenge to strike minority juror without providing sufficient race neutral explanation.*
- Torres v. Commissioner of Correction, 175 CA 460. 80A
- Habeas corpus; claim that respondent Commissioner of Correction improperly failed to give petitioner risk reduction earned credits for conduct that occurred during period of time that petitioner was confined as pretrial detainee; whether habeas court abused discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal where issues involved matters of first impression; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner was not eligible for risk reduction earned credits as pretrial detainee; whether language of applicable statute (§ 18-98e) was clear and unambiguous, and demonstrated that legislature intended to afford only sentenced inmates opportunity to earn risk reduction earned credits; claim that § 18-98e violates equal protection clause because it does not permit indigent individuals who are held in presentence confinement to earn risk reduction credits; whether habeas court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over claim.*
- Washburne v. Madison, 175 CA 613. 233A
- Negligence; action for damages for injuries to third grade student while playing soccer in physical education class; claim that safety guideline in physical education guide of defendant board of education indicating that students should wear shin guards for additional protection created ministerial duty; claim that, even if defendants' acts or omissions were discretionary in nature, there remained genuine issue of material fact as to whether student had been subject to imminent harm and, thus, fell within identifiable person/imminent harm exception to governmental immunity; whether foreseeability of injury can demonstrate that harm is imminent without also showing that probability that injury will occur from dangerous condition is high enough to necessitate that defendants act to prevent it.*

(continued on next page)

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Henderson, 175 CA 474	94A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; claim that plaintiff failed to demonstrate standing to foreclose because it had not been assigned mortgage and note until after action commenced; whether affidavit stating that plaintiff was holder of note and copy of note were sufficient to establish, for summary judgment purposes, standing to foreclose; whether court properly summarily disposed of amended special defenses that substantively were nearly identical to ones previously stricken; whether defendant was deprived of evidentiary hearing on issue of standing; whether defendant failed to establish genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff had standing to foreclose; whether defendant was deprived of due process as to several motions and request filed during litigation; whether defendant was provided full and fair opportunity to present counterarguments to motion for summary judgment as to liability; reviewability of claim that defendant was prevented from presenting oral argument on motion to dismiss; whether defendant was deprived of evidentiary hearing on second motion to dismiss where defendant submitted no proof to rebut jurisdictional allegations in plaintiff's complaint; whether defendant was deprived of oral argument on motion for continuance; whether court had discretion to deny motion to reargue without hearing.</i>	
Volume 175 Cumulative Table of Cases	253A

MISCELLANEOUS

Small Claims Decentralization	1B
---	----

ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES

September 4, 2017 through September 2, 2018	1C
---	----
